



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/805,313	03/13/2001	Gigi C. Gordon	GOR05 P-300A	1788

277 7590 07/16/2003

PRICE HENEVELD COOPER DEWITT & LITTON
695 KENMOOR, S.E.
P O BOX 2567
GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49501

EXAMINER

GREEN, BRIAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3611

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/805,313

Applicant(s)

GORDON, GIGI C.

Examiner

Brian K. Green

Art Unit

3611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) 15
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 9, 2003 has been entered.

Drawings

The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed on June 9, 2003 have been disapproved. In figures 1-4, the figures should not include at the bottom of each page an additional figure number, i.e. FIG. 1, FIG. 2, etc.

The drawings are objected to because in figures 1-4, each of the figures must be separately labeled, i.e. Fig. 1a, Fig. 1b, etc. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Stating in claims 1,6,14, and 18, that the surface includes “auto” and “furniture”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Stating in claims 1,6,14, and 18, that the surface includes "auto" and "furniture". Auto and furniture are broader terms than car and table which are used in the specification as originally filed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3,6-10,12, and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,702,381).

Carter et al. shows in figures 1-3 the idea of labeling towels (T) with indicia (32) for indicating what the towel is to be used for, i.e. the towel with "HIS" is used for the man

Art Unit: 3611

of the household and the towel with "HERS" is used for the lady of the house. Carter et al. does not specifically disclose the use of two or more towels. Carter et al. shows in figure 2 the idea of labeling a towel with HIS or HERS to indicate what surface (person) the towel is to be used on. It would have been obvious to one in the art to modify Carter et al. by using two or more towels in which one of the towels is labeled with HIS and another of the towels is labeled with HERS since this would allow a husband and wife to easily determine which towel is theirs. The towel with "HIS" is used for cleaning the man's hands, body, face, car, shoes, bathroom, etc. and the towel with "HERS" is used for cleaning the ladies' hands, body, face, car, shoes, bathroom, etc. The towels (T) can be used for cleaning sinks, counters, walls, floors, etc. In regard to claim 3, each of the letters of "HIS" and "HERS" are considered to be symbols. In regard to claim 10, Carter et al. does not disclose whether the indicia has a color which is different from the color of the towel. It would have been obvious to one in the art to modify Carter et al. by making the indicia of the towel different from the color of the towel since this would allow the indicia on the towel to be seen in a better manner. In regard to claim 12, Carter et al. does not disclose how the indicia is applied to the towel. Lithographic, printing, and stenciling are all well known and conventional processes. It would have been obvious to one in the art to modify Carter et al. by using one of these techniques to attach the indicia to the towel since this would allow the indicia to be attached to the towel in an easier, faster, and less expensive manner.

Art Unit: 3611

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,702,381) in view of Pirraglia et al. (Des. 390,403).

Carter et al. discloses the applicant's basic inventive concept except for making the outline of the scrubber in the shape of the cleaning article. Pirraglia et al. shows in figure 1 the idea of making the outline of a towel in the shape of a person. In view of the teachings of Pirraglia et al. it would have been obvious to one in the art to modify Carter et al. by making the outline in the shape of a person or an object (in this case the cleaning article) since this would allow the desired towel to be identified in an easier manner.

7. Claims 5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,702,381) in view of Inteso (U. S. Patent No. 4,598,488).

Carter et al. does not disclose making the indicia raised relative to the surface of the towel. Inteso discloses in figure 1 and in column 1, lines 10-20 the idea of embroidering indicia on a towel. The embroidered indicia would create raised indicia. In view of the teachings of Inteso it would have been obvious to one in the art to modify Carter et al. by making the indicia raised since this would create a more aesthetically pleasing display.

Claims 5, 11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter et al. (U. S. Patent No. 4,702,381) in view of Brach, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,487,203).

Art Unit: 3611

In regard to claims 5 and 13, Carter et al. does not disclose making the indicia raised relative to the surface of the towel. Brach, Jr. et al. discloses in figure 6 the idea of making the indicia (7) raised. In view of the teachings of Brach, Jr. et al. it would have been obvious to one in the art to modify Carter et al. by making the indicia raised since this would create a more aesthetically pleasing display. In regard to claim 11, Carter et al. does not disclose making the indicia recessed relative to the surface of the towel. Brach, Jr. et al. discloses in figure 5 the idea of making the indicia (7) recessed. In view of the teachings of Brach, Jr. et al. it would have been obvious to one in the art to modify Carter et al. by making the indicia recessed since this would create a more aesthetically pleasing display.

Claims 1-3,6-10,12, and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Scotch-Brite scour pads with indicia" (listed on the form 1449).

"Scotch-Brite scour pads with indicia" shows a scouring pad including indicia thereon. The indicia is on a package that encloses and engages the pad. The indicia is printed on the package and includes words which indicate that the pad is to be used on cast iron pots and includes a symbol of a pot. "Scotch-Brite scour pads with indicia" also indicates that another product "Scotch-Brite Cookware sponge" can be used on tubs. "Scotch-Brite scour pads with indicia" does not specifically show a second cleaning article for cleaning a different article. It would have been obvious to one in the art to modify "Scotch-Brite scour pads with indicia" by adding a "Scotch-Brite Cookware sponge" since this would allow a wider range of articles to be properly cleaned within a

Art Unit: 3611

household. The indicia on the "Scotch-Brite Cookware sponge" would be similar to the indicia on the "Scotch-Brite scour pads with indicia" except it would be directed to the purposes of the "Scotch-Brite Cookware sponge". In regard to claim 10, "ScotchBrite scour pads with indicia" does not disclose whether the indicia has a color which is different from the color of the pad. It would have been obvious to one in the art to modify "Scotch-Brite scour pads with indicia" by making the indicia different from the color of the pad since this would allow the indicia to be seen in a better manner.

9. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Scotch-Brite scour pads with indicia" as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Demner (U. S. Patent No. 3,496,589).

"Scotch-Brite scour pads with indicia" discloses the applicant's basic inventive concept except for making the outline of the scrubber in the shape of the cleaning article. Demner shows in figure 1 the idea of making the cleaning article in the shape of the article to be cleaned. In view of the teachings of Demner it would have been obvious to one in the art to modify "Scotch-Brite scour pads with indicia" by making the outline in the shape of the article to be cleaned since this would allow the desired cleaning article to be identified in an easier manner.

10. Claims 5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U. S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "ScotchBrite scour pads with indicia" as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Rogers et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,133,707).

Art Unit: 3611

"Scotch-Brite scour pads with indicia" does not disclose making the indicia raised. Rogers discloses in figures 1 and 2 and in column 2, lines 10-20 the idea of embossing the indicia on a sheet. In view of the teachings of Rogers et al. it would have been obvious to one in the art to modify "Scotch-Brite scour pads with indicia" by making the indicia raised since this would create a more aesthetically pleasing display. Claims 5, 11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Scotch-Brite scour pads with indicia" as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Brach, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,487,203). In regard to claims 5 and 13, "Scotch-Brite scour pads with indicia" does not disclose making the indicia raised relative to the surface of the towel. Brach, Jr. et al. discloses in figure 6 the idea of making the indicia (7) raised. In view of the teachings of Brach, Jr. et al. it would have been obvious to one in the art to modify "Scotch-Brite scour pads with indicia" by making the indicia raised since this would create a more aesthetically pleasing display. In regard to claim 11, "Scotch-Brite scour pads with indicia" does not disclose making the indicia recessed relative to the surface of the towel. Brach, Jr. et al. discloses in figure 5 the idea of making the indicia (7) recessed. In view of the teachings of Brach, Jr. et al. it would have been obvious to one in the art to modify "Scotch-Brite scour pads with indicia" by making the indicia recessed since this would create a more aesthetically pleasing display.

Applicant's arguments filed June 9, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that nowhere does Carter et al. indicate that the intended cleaning application for the article discloses therein would be even remotely associated with cleaning a surface selected from a group consisting essentially of dishes, glassware, cooking pots and pans, kitchen counters, kitchen cabinets, kitchen sinks, dining tables, windows, and furniture, as presently claimed. The applicant defines in the claims that the system is for “cleaning” the above mentioned surfaces. As broadly defined, the towels of Carter et al. can clearly be used to clean the surfaces mentioned above, i.e. the bathroom floor (when it gets wet), the kitchen counter (when it gets wet), etc.

The applicant argues that Carter et al. only discloses a single towel and does not disclose using the indicia (32) to distinguish one cleaning application from another. Carter et al. discloses the use of a towel that includes indicia (32) thereon. The indicia can include the word HIS or the word HERS. Clearly it is within one having ordinary skill in the art to provide two or more towels in which one of the towels includes the word HIS and another of the towels includes the word HERS in order to allow a husband and wife to distinguish between their respective towels. The indicia (32) on the towel would distinguish the cleaning applications from one another.

The applicant argues that Carter et al. makes no reference to or suggestion to make the indicia a different color as defined in claims 10 and 12. Carter et al. discloses the idea of attaching indicia onto towels. Clearly the indicia on the towel would have to be a different color than the towel in order to allow the indicia to be clearly seen.

The applicant argues that Pirraglia et al. cannot be viewed as disclosing a specific intended cleaning application having an indicia in the form thereof. Pirraglia et al. is merely being used to teach that it is known to make a towel into the specific shape of an object. The

Art Unit: 3611

shape of the towel can be used to identify one towel from another towel. It is considered within one skilled in the art to vary the shape of the towel for any desired purpose.

The applicant argues that the "Scotch-Brite" scour pads do not suggest or teach the desirability of providing a plurality of cleaning articles, each having a different cleaning application. The examiner disagrees since "Scotch-Brite scour pads with indicia" also indicates that another product "Scotch-Brite Cookware sponge" can be used on tubs. This indicia on the "Scotch-Brite" scour pads clearly indicates that the scour pads can be used with other cleaning articles, each having a different cleaning application.

The applicant argues that Demner does not disclose a plurality of articles having a different intended cleaning application. Demner is merely being used to show that it is known to make a cleaning article in the shape of the intended cleaning application. "Scotch-Brite" already discloses the idea of using a plurality of cleaning articles for different cleaning applications.

The applicant argues that there is no motivation or suggestion to modify "Scotch-Brite" in view of Rogers et al. Rogers et al. is merely being used to show that it is known to emboss indicia onto a sheet. Rogers et al. provides the advantage (motivation) of creating a more aesthetically pleasing display, i.e. placing raised indicia on the package of "Scotch-Brite".

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 3611

Hansen teaches the use of labels that are attached to a device for indicating instructions on how to use a device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian K. Green whose telephone number is (703) 308-1011. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lesley Morris can be reached on (703) 308-0629. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9326 for regular communications and (703) 872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-4177.


BRIAN K. GREEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

bkg
July 14, 2003